

Collective Motion under Beacon-referenced Cyclic Pursuit

Kevin S. Galloway^a, Biswadip Dey^b

^a*Electrical and Computer Engineering Department, United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, MD 21402, USA*

^b*Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544, USA*

Abstract

Cyclic pursuit frameworks, which are built upon pursuit interactions between neighboring agents in a cycle graph, provide an efficient way to create useful global behaviors in a collective of autonomous robots. Previous work has considered cyclic pursuit with a constant bearing (CB) pursuit law and has demonstrated the existence of circling equilibria for the corresponding dynamics. In this work we propose a beacon-referenced version of the CB pursuit law, wherein a stationary beacon provides an additional reference for the individual agents in the collective. When implemented in a cyclic framework, we show that the resulting dynamics admit relative equilibria corresponding to a circling orbit around the beacon, with the circling radius and the distribution of agents along the orbit determined by parameters of the proposed feedback law. We also derive necessary conditions for stability of the circling equilibria, which provides a guide for parameter selection. Finally, by introducing a change of variables, we demonstrate the existence of a family of invariant manifolds related to spiraling motions around the beacon which preserve the “pure shape” of the collective, and we carry out an analysis of the reduced dynamics on a representative manifold.

Key words: Decentralized control; Multi-agent system; Pursuit problems; Co-operative control; Geometric approaches; Autonomous mobile robots; Circulant matrices; Directed graphs; Bearings only tracking

1 Introduction

A group of autonomous agents can accomplish certain missions more effectively and efficiently than individuals working alone, which may explain why such collective behaviors are often observed in nature [2,5,14,22] and increasingly implemented in robotic applications. Collective motion plays a pivotal role in modern robotics and engineering, especially in the area of search and rescue missions [13,18], surveillance [3] and environmental monitoring [8,17]. As one primary objective in this context has been to achieve control using information only about the local neighbors, dyadic pursuit interactions serve as an effective building block for collective motion [16,20,21,23,24,26,27]. Pursuit strategies are used in natural settings for capturing prey or pursuing a potential mate, and find application in robotic settings for rendezvous, missile defense, etc. Moreover, they provide an intuitive method for prescribing desired geometric relationships between autonomous agents, and can be executed by means of feedback-based pursuit laws such as the constant bearing (CB) pursuit law developed in [28].

When a collective of agents implement CB pursuit in

a cyclic manner (i.e. agent i pursues agent $i + 1$, with the last agent pursuing the first), the previous work of one of the authors has demonstrated existence of useful collective motions such as circling, spiraling, and rectilinear motion [11]. For collectives of three agents, subsequent work established stability properties (in terms of the control parameters) and revealed existence of trajectories that are periodic in shape and undergo precession in physical space [12]. However, in this line of work, both the location of the circumcenter (with respect to any inertial frame) and the radius of the circular orbit were determined by initial conditions rather than control parameters.

In the current work, we employ a modified version of the CB control law, in which the pursuer is attentive to both a neighboring agent as well as to a stationary beacon. In some sense this beacon-referenced control law (first introduced in [9]) could be viewed as a conflicted or distracted CB pursuit law in which the agent attempts to simultaneously execute possibly conflicting pursuit strategies with respect to the neighboring agent and the beacon. Attention to the neighboring agent may represent a desire to maintain affiliation with a collective, while the beacon could represent an attractive food source (in the biological setting) or a target of interest for an unmanned vehicle. In what follows, we con-

Email addresses: kgallowa@usna.edu (Kevin S. Galloway), biswadip@princeton.edu (Biswadip Dey).

sider an n -agent collective in which each agent i employs this “beacon-referenced” CB control law with respect to agent $i + 1$ and a common beacon. Although the control law itself does not specifically incorporate a desired station-keeping range from the beacon, we will demonstrate that when employed in a cyclic pursuit framework, circling equilibria exist which are centered on the beacon position and have a radius determined by the control parameters (rather than initial conditions, as is true in the traditional cyclic pursuit case). We will also demonstrate the existence of invariant manifolds on which the pure shape of the collective is preserved, typically corresponding to spiraling motions in the physical space.

Beacon-referenced (or “target-centric”) cyclic pursuit has also been addressed in [6,19]. In these works, the authors employ a classical pursuit steering law with respect to a virtual point which lies along the line connecting the pursued neighboring agent to the beacon. While similar in spirit, our control law is fundamentally different in that it is based on constant bearing pursuit with respect to two targets rather than classical pursuit of a virtual point between the targets. Also, our work addresses pure shape equilibria (i.e. motions that render the pure shape of the collective constant) in addition to circling relative equilibria.

The main contribution of the current work is to develop conditions for existence and stability of circling equilibria as well as invariant manifolds corresponding to pure shape equilibria in beacon-referenced cyclic pursuit collectives. This work expands on the authors’ original analysis in [9,10] by deriving a stricter version of the necessary conditions for local stability of the circling equilibria (section 5) and by providing an analysis of the reduced dynamics on the invariant manifolds (section 7). While our approach is motivated by the numerous robotic station-keeping applications which require autonomous agents to orbit a specified location while maintaining a fixed formation shape and scale (e.g. search and rescue, environmental sensing, etc.), we also note that this work may provide insights into the mechanisms underlying collective behavior observed in nature. For example, beacon-referenced cyclic pursuit may provide tools for modeling the “explore-exploit” behavior observed in animal collectives (e.g. during honeybees’ search for food sources [25]).

The paper proceeds as follows. In section 2, we state the dynamics governing a collective of autonomous agents interacting with a fixed beacon, and we derive appropriate shape variables for describing the relative states of the agents. In section 3 we present the beacon-referenced CB pursuit law and develop the associated closed-loop shape dynamics which form the basis for the subsequent analysis. Section 4 details conditions for existence of circling equilibria, and in section 5 we derive necessary conditions for local stability of the circling equilibria. These necessary conditions may be used to

guide parameter selection to avoid combinations that are known to result in instability. In section 6, a change of variables is used to reveal the existence of a family of invariant submanifolds corresponding to spiral motions in the real space which maintain the pure shape of the formation (i.e. the shape up to geometric similarity), and an analysis of the reduced dynamics on the manifold is presented in section 7.

2 Problem Formulation

As discussed in [11], three key components are necessary to describe any decentralized algorithm for coordinated motion by a group of autonomous vehicles (agents). Once the agents’ dynamics have been described using appropriate *generative models*, we specify the interaction structure by a directed *attention graph*. Finally, we prescribe the *feedback laws* governing the motion of individual agents. In what follows, we discuss each of these building blocks in the current context.

2.1 Generative Model: Agents as Self-Steering Particles

As we treat the agents as unit-mass self-steering particles on a plane [15], natural Frenet frame equations [4] provide a way to describe their motion. Then, by letting $\mathbf{r}_i$ and $\mathbf{x}_i$ denote the position and normalized velocity of the i -th agent, its dynamics can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\mathbf{r}}_i &= \nu_i \mathbf{x}_i \\ \dot{\mathbf{x}}_i &= \nu_i u_i \mathbf{y}_i \\ \dot{\mathbf{y}}_i &= -\nu_i u_i \mathbf{x}_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n,\end{aligned}\tag{1}$$

where $\mathbf{y}_i$ is the orthogonal rotation of $\mathbf{x}_i$ in the counter-clockwise direction, ν_i denotes speed, and u_i is the natural curvature viewed as a steering control. We also introduce a *beacon* which is located on the plane at position $\mathbf{r}_b$, with a fixed frame $[\mathbf{x}_b \ \mathbf{y}_b]$ attached to it. Without loss of generality, the frame $[\mathbf{x}_b \ \mathbf{y}_b]$ can be interpreted as the inertial frame of reference.

Alternatively, we can pack $\mathbf{r}_i$, $\mathbf{x}_i$, $\mathbf{y}_i$ inside a matrix $g_i \triangleq [\mathbf{x}_i \ \mathbf{y}_i \ \mathbf{r}_i; 0 \ 0 \ 1]$. This, by letting us represent the natural Frenet frame equations (1) as

$$\dot{g}_i = g_i \xi_i = \nu_i g_i (X_0 + u_i X_2),\tag{2}$$

allows us to express the underlying dynamics as a left invariant dynamics on $SE(2)$, the matrix Lie-group of planar rigid body motion. Here X_0 and X_2 represent standard basis elements of the associated Lie-algebra $\mathfrak{se}(2)$. In a similar way, $g_b \in SE(2)$ is the Lie-group representation of the beacon.

2.2 Attention Graph

Next, we define a directed graph $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{A})$ with node set $\mathcal{N} = \{1, 2, \dots, n, b\}$, and the arc set is defined as $\mathcal{A} = \{(i, i+1), (i, b) | i = 1, \dots, n\}$ ¹. This weakly connected *attention graph* [11] $\mathcal{G}$ captures the dyadic interactions in this problem.

2.3 Reduction to Shape Space with Constraints

Due to our interest in the agents' motion relative to the beacon, we formulate a reduction to the shape space. We begin by introducing the following set of variables along arcs of the attention graph $\mathcal{G}$:

$$\tilde{g}_{i,i+1} = g_{i+1}^{-1} g_i \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{g}_{ib} = g_b^{-1} g_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (3)$$

Although, these variables overparameterize the underlying space of relative position and orientation, this effect is taken into account by considering the constraints present in the system. Clearly, the variables $\tilde{g}_{i,i+1}$ respect the cycle closure constraint given by

$$\prod_{i=1}^n \tilde{g}_{i,i+1} = \tilde{g}_{n1} \tilde{g}_{n-1,n} \cdots \tilde{g}_{23} \tilde{g}_{12} = \mathbb{I}_3, \quad (4)$$

where $\mathbb{I}_3$ is the 3×3 identity matrix. Moreover, we have

$$\tilde{g}_{i,i+1} = \tilde{g}_{i+1,b}^{-1} \tilde{g}_{ib}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n-1, \quad (5)$$

which pose consistency conditions on the space of shape variables. We should also note that (4) and (5) together ensure $\tilde{g}_{n1} = \tilde{g}_{1b}^{-1} \tilde{g}_{nb}$.

Then it is a straightforward exercise to show that the shape dynamics can be expressed as

$$\dot{\tilde{g}}_{ib} = \tilde{g}_{ib} \xi_i, \quad \text{and} \quad \dot{\tilde{g}}_{i,i+1} = \tilde{g}_{i,i+1} \tilde{\xi}_{i,i+1}, \quad (6)$$

where $\tilde{\xi}_{i,i+1} = \xi_i - \tilde{g}_{i,i+1}^{-1} \xi_{i+1} \tilde{g}_{i,i+1}$. It has been shown earlier [11] that the sub-manifolds defined by these constraints (4)-(5) are invariant under the shape dynamics (6). As a consequence, the constraints will be satisfied for all future time if they hold true initially.

Next, we introduce a set of scalar variables to parametrize the underlying shape space, as depicted in Figure 1. By letting $R(\Omega) \in SO(2)$ denote a counter-clockwise planar rotation through an angle Ω , we define




Fig. 1. Illustration of the scalar shape variables (ρ_i , ρ_{ib} , θ_i , κ_i and κ_{ib}) used in the analysis of a beacon-referenced cyclic CB pursuit system with n -agents.

a set of scalar shape variables ρ_i , ρ_{ib} , κ_i , θ_i , κ_{ib} and ϑ_i as

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_i &= |\mathbf{r}_{i+1,i}|, & \rho_{ib} &= |\mathbf{r}_{b,i}|, \\ R(\kappa_i) \mathbf{x}_i &= \frac{\mathbf{r}_{i+1,i}}{|\mathbf{r}_{i+1,i}|}, & R(\theta_i) \mathbf{x}_i &= -\frac{\mathbf{r}_{i,i-1}}{|\mathbf{r}_{i,i-1}|} \\ R(\kappa_{ib}) \mathbf{x}_i &= \frac{\mathbf{r}_{b,i}}{|\mathbf{r}_{b,i}|}, & R(\pi - \vartheta_i) \mathbf{x}_b &= \frac{\mathbf{r}_{b,i}}{|\mathbf{r}_{b,i}|}, \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $\mathbf{r}_{i,j} = \mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j$ represents the position of i -th agent relative to the j -th agent. This allows us to express the cycle closure constraint (4) as

$$R\left(\sum_{i=1}^n (\pi + \kappa_i - \theta_{i+1})\right) = \mathbb{I}_2 \quad (8)$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \rho_i R\left(\sum_{j=1}^i (\pi + \kappa_j - \theta_{j+1})\right) = 0. \quad (9)$$

In a similar way, the consistency conditions (5) can be represented as

$$R(\vartheta_i - \vartheta_{i+1}) = R(\pi + \kappa_i - \theta_{i+1} + \kappa_{i+1,b} - \kappa_{ib}) \quad (10)$$

$$\rho_i \mathbb{I}_2 = \rho_{ib} R(\kappa_{ib} - \kappa_i) + \rho_{i+1,b} R(\kappa_{i+1,b} - \theta_{i+1}) \quad (11)$$

for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$.

Now we shift our attention to the following observation which provides a simplification to consider only a subset of these variables and constraints:

(1) For a particular value of ϑ_1 , (10) yields an explicit formulation for the scalar shape variables ϑ_i , $i = 2, \dots, n$ in terms of other shape variables;

(2) The choice of beacon frame $[\mathbf{x}_b \ \mathbf{y}_b]$ is arbitrary and the proposed feedback law (in Sec. 3) is invariant to any rotation of the beacon frame;

(3) The constraints given by (8), (9) and (11) can be imposed by (8) along with (11) for $i = 1, \dots, n$.

Therefore, the underlying shape space can be described by the scalar shape variables $\{\kappa_i, \kappa_{ib}, \theta_i, \rho_i, \rho_{ib}\}$,

¹ Addition in the index variables should be interpreted modulo n throughout this paper.

subject to the following constraints

$$R\left(\sum_{i=1}^n(\pi + \kappa_i - \theta_{i+1})\right) = \mathbb{I}_2 \quad (12)$$

$$\rho_i \mathbb{I}_2 = \rho_{ib} R(\kappa_{ib} - \kappa_i) + \rho_{i+1,b} R(\kappa_{i+1,b} - \theta_{i+1}), \quad (13)$$

for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Additionally we require ρ_i to be positive for the shape variables (7) to be well-defined.

3 Beacon-referenced CB pursuit law

Here we propose a beacon-referenced CB pursuit law, which we can express as a convex combination of two fundamental building blocks:

$$u_i = (1 - \lambda)u_{CB}^i + \lambda u_B^i, \quad \lambda \in [0, 1]. \quad (14)$$

Here u_{CB}^i is given by the original CB pursuit law [28] referenced to agent $i+1$, and u_B^i represents the deviation from a desired bearing angle to the beacon, as will be made clear below. In particular, we define

$$u_{CB}^i = -\mu_i \left(R(\alpha_i) \mathbf{y}_i \cdot \frac{\mathbf{r}_{i,i+1}}{|\mathbf{r}_{i,i+1}|} \right) - \frac{1}{\nu_i |\mathbf{r}_{i,i+1}|} \left(\frac{\mathbf{r}_{i,i+1}}{|\mathbf{r}_{i,i+1}|} \cdot R(\pi/2) \dot{\mathbf{r}}_{i,i+1} \right), \quad (15)$$

where $\mu_i > 0$ is a control gain. The angle $\alpha_i \in S^1$ represents the desired offset between the i -th agent's heading and its bearing to agent $i+1$. The beacon tracking component is defined as

$$u_B^i = -\mu_i^b \left(R(\alpha_{ib}) \mathbf{y}_i \cdot \frac{\mathbf{r}_{i,b}}{|\mathbf{r}_{i,b}|} \right), \quad (16)$$

with $\mu_i^b > 0$ being the control gain. The angle $\alpha_{ib} \in S^1$ represents the desired offset between the i -th agent's heading and its bearing to the beacon location. These two objectives might conflict with each other. The parameter λ maintains a balance between these two objectives, and u_i reverts back to the original CB pursuit law whenever $\lambda = 0$. On the other extreme, the interaction between individual agents gets completely lost for $\lambda = 1$. Therefore we restrict λ to the open interval $(0, 1)$ for the rest of our analysis.

In terms of scalar shape variables, the feedback law can be expressed as

$$u_i = \lambda \mu_i^b \sin(\kappa_{ib} - \alpha_{ib}) + (1 - \lambda) \mu_i \sin(\kappa_i - \alpha_i) + \frac{1 - \lambda}{\rho_i} \left(\sin \kappa_i + \frac{\nu_{i+1}}{\nu_i} \sin \theta_{i+1} \right). \quad (17)$$

Remark 1 As noted in [28], the last component of this feedback law (17) is the angular speed at which the baseline between agent i and agent $i+1$ is rotating around

the agent i . Therefore it is plausible to evaluate the steering command u_i without explicit range measurement, although it will require an appropriate sensing mechanism (mimicking the principle of compound eyes in visual insects).

Before delving into further analysis, we introduce the following assumptions:

(A1) The agents have constant and equal speed. Hence, without loss of generality, we can assume $v_i = 1$ for every $i = 1, \dots, n$.

(A2) The controller gains are common and equal for all agents, i.e. $\mu_i = \mu_i^b = \mu$, $i = 1, \dots, n$.

(A3) The bearing angles toward the beacon are equal for all agents, i.e. $\alpha_{ib} = \alpha_0$, $i = 1, \dots, n$.

With these simplifying assumptions (A1)-(A3), the closed loop shape dynamics can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\rho}_i &= -(\cos \kappa_i + \cos \theta_{i+1}) \\ \dot{\kappa}_i &= -\mu[(1 - \lambda) \sin(\kappa_i - \alpha_i) + \lambda \sin(\kappa_{ib} - \alpha_0)] \\ &\quad + \frac{\lambda}{\rho_i} [\sin \kappa_i + \sin \theta_{i+1}] \\ \dot{\theta}_i &= \dot{\kappa}_i - \frac{1}{\rho_i} [\sin \kappa_i + \sin \theta_{i+1}] + \frac{1}{\rho_{i-1}} [\sin \kappa_{i-1} + \sin \theta_i] \\ \dot{\rho}_{ib} &= -\cos \kappa_{ib} \\ \dot{\kappa}_{ib} &= \dot{\kappa}_i - \frac{1}{\rho_i} [\sin \kappa_i + \sin \theta_{i+1}] + \frac{1}{\rho_{ib}} \sin \kappa_{ib} \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

for $i = 1, \dots, n$, subject to the cycle closure constraint (12) and consistency conditions (13). As discussed earlier, constraints (12)-(13) are preserved under the shape dynamics. The non-collocation constraint (i.e. $\rho_i > 0$) is required for a well-defined control law but is not necessarily preserved by the shape dynamics, and therefore we restrict our analysis away from collision states.

4 Relative equilibria

In this section we explore the equilibria of the closed loop shape dynamics (18), which correspond to the relative equilibria of the original dynamics (1) with the beacon-referenced CB pursuit law (14). We begin our analysis by setting the dynamics of ρ_{ib} and ρ_i to zero, and that leads to equilibria values of κ_{ib} and θ_i given by

$$\kappa_{ib} = \pm \frac{\pi}{2}, \quad \text{and} \quad \theta_{i+1} = \pi \pm \kappa_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (19)$$

Similarly, by setting the dynamics of θ_i , κ_i , and κ_{ib} to zero, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{\rho_i} (\sin \kappa_i + \sin \theta_{i+1}) = \frac{1}{\rho_{i-1}} (\sin \kappa_{i-1} + \sin \theta_i), \quad (20)$$

$$\frac{1}{\rho_i} (\sin \kappa_i + \sin \theta_{i+1}) = \frac{1}{\rho_{ib}} \sin \kappa_{ib}, \quad (21)$$

for $i = 1, \dots, n$. As the solution $\theta_{i+1} = \pi + \kappa_i$ leads to a contradiction in (21), θ_i must satisfy

$$\theta_{i+1} = \pi - \kappa_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad (22)$$

at equilibria of the shape dynamics. Then, by introducing a new variable γ_i defined as

$$\gamma_i \triangleq \frac{1}{\rho_i} (\sin \kappa_i + \sin \theta_{i+1}) = \frac{2}{\rho_i} \sin \kappa_i, \quad (23)$$

we obtain

$$\gamma_i = \gamma_{i-1} \quad i = 1, \dots, n \quad (24)$$

from (20). This condition, along with (21), leads to

$$\gamma_i = \frac{\sin \kappa_{ib}}{\rho_{ib}} = \frac{\sin \kappa_{i-1,b}}{\rho_{i-1,b}} \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad (25)$$

and combined with (19), we have

$$\kappa_{ib} = \begin{cases} \pi/2 & \forall i = 1, \dots, n, \\ -\pi/2 & \forall i = 1, \dots, n. \end{cases} \quad \text{or} \quad (26)$$

Then it follows from (25) and (26), that all agents will be equi-distant from the beacon at any relative equilibrium. Hence, *any relative equilibrium of the system must be a circling equilibrium*, as depicted in Figure 2.

Next, by setting the dynamics of κ_i to zero, we have

$$\mu \left[(1 - \lambda) \sin(\kappa_i - \alpha_i) + \lambda \sin(\kappa_{ib} - \alpha_0) \right] = \lambda \gamma_i \quad (27)$$




Fig. 2. This Matlab simulation shows trajectories of the full space dynamics (1) for $n = 4$, with $\alpha_1 = \pi/8$, $\alpha_2 = \pi/6$, $\alpha_3 = \pi/3$, $\alpha_4 = \pi/3$, and $\alpha_0 = \pi/4$. The trajectories converge to a circling equilibrium, wherein both circling radius and distribution of agents along the circumference are determined by control parameters.

for $i = 1, \dots, n$. As $\kappa_{ib} = \pm\pi/2$ and $\theta_{i+1} = \pi - \kappa_i$ at a relative equilibrium, (27) yields an equilibrium value for ρ_i given by

$$\rho_i = \frac{2\lambda \sin \kappa_{ib} \sin \kappa_i}{\mu(1 - \lambda) \sin \kappa_{ib} \sin(\kappa_i - \alpha_i) + \mu\lambda \cos \alpha_0}. \quad (28)$$

Similarly, (21) yields an equilibrium value of ρ_{ib} as

$$\rho_{ib} = \frac{\lambda}{\mu(1 - \lambda) \sin \kappa_{ib} \sin(\kappa_i - \alpha_i) + \mu\lambda \cos \alpha_0}. \quad (29)$$

Moreover, as both ρ_i and ρ_{ib} are required to be positive, (28) and (29) lead to the following *necessary conditions* for existence of a circling equilibrium:

$$\lambda \cos \alpha_0 + (1 - \lambda) \sin \kappa_{ib} \sin(\kappa_i - \alpha_i) > 0 \quad (30)$$

$$\text{and, } \sin \kappa_{ib} \sin \kappa_i > 0. \quad (31)$$

The preceding discussion leads to the following theorem, which provides a complete characterization of the relative equilibria for the shape dynamics (18).

Theorem 2 Consider a beacon-referenced cyclic CB pursuit system with n agents, and let its closed loop shape dynamics (18) be parametrized by μ , λ , α_0 , and $\{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\}$. Then, the following statements hold true:

(a) The only possible relative equilibria are circling equilibria.

(b) Whenever $\sin(\sum \alpha_i) \neq 0$, a circling equilibrium exists if and only if there exists $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\sigma = (\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_n) \in \{-1, 1\}^n$ such that

(i) the cardinality M of the subset $\{\sigma_i | \sigma_i = 1, i = 1, \dots, n\}$ satisfies

$$2M - n \neq 0, \quad (32)$$

and

(ii) the following conditions hold true

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda \cos \alpha_0 + (1 - \lambda) \sin \alpha^* &> 0, \\ \sin(\alpha^* + \sigma_i \alpha_i) &> 0, \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

for $i = 1, \dots, n$, where α^* is defined as

$$\alpha^* = \left(\frac{m + M - n}{2M - n} \right) \pi - \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{\alpha_i}{2M - n} \right). \quad (34)$$

Moreover, at equilibrium, we have either $\kappa_{ib} = \pi/2$, $i = 1, \dots, n$ or $\kappa_{ib} = -\pi/2$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, and equilibrium values of κ_i , ρ_{ib} and ρ_i can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_i &= \frac{\pi(1 - \sigma_i)}{2} + (\sigma_i \alpha^* + \alpha_i) \\ \rho_{ib} &= \frac{\lambda}{\mu\lambda \cos \alpha_0 + \mu(1 - \lambda) \sin \kappa_{ib} \sin \alpha^*} \\ \rho_i &= 2\rho_{ib} \sin \kappa_{ib} \sin \kappa_i. \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

Proof. The first statement of the theorem directly follows from (25) and (26). Also, it follows from (22), (28), (29) and (31), that the equilibrium values of ρ_i , ρ_{ib} , θ_i and κ_{ib} can be expressed in terms of the equilibrium values of κ_i . Now, in order to obtain a complete characterization of the relative equilibria, we focus on solving the equilibrium values of κ_i . Clearly, (27) together with (24) leads to

$$\sin(\kappa_{i+1} - \alpha_{i+1}) = \sin(\kappa_i - \alpha_i), \quad (36)$$

at every relative equilibrium of the dynamics, and solving (36) we have

$$\kappa_{i+1} - \alpha_{i+1} = \begin{cases} \kappa_i - \alpha_i \\ \pi - (\kappa_i - \alpha_i) \end{cases} \quad (37a)$$

$$(37b)$$

for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Equilibrium values of κ_i can therefore be obtained by solving (37a)-(37b) in conjunction with the shape variable constraints (12)-(13).

Then, by letting α^* represent the bearing angle offset ($\kappa_1 - \alpha_1$) at a relative equilibrium, (37a)-(37b) lead to either of the two possibilities for $(\kappa_2 - \alpha_2)$, namely α^* or $\pi - \alpha^*$. Furthermore, as this aspect of binary possibilities holds true for every agent, the possible solutions for (36) can be illustrated graphically via a binary tree (as shown in Figure 3). Each branch in this binary tree represents a candidate solution for κ_i . In particular, the leftmost branch in this tree represents the relative equilibrium where $\kappa_i - \alpha_i = \kappa_{i+1} - \alpha_{i+1}$ for each $i = 1, \dots, n$.

In light of (22), we can express the cycle closure constraint (12) as

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \kappa_i = m\pi, \quad m \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad (38)$$

at every relative equilibrium, i.e. the equilibrium values of κ_i must add up to an integral multiple of π . We now consider a representative branch of the binary tree (Figure 3), along which (I) $\kappa_i - \alpha_i = \alpha^*$ for M agents ($1 \leq M \leq n$), and (II) $\kappa_i - \alpha_i = \pi - \alpha^*$ for the remaining $n - M$ agents. Along this particular solution branch, (38) can be expressed as

$$(2M - n)\alpha^* = (m + M - n)\pi - \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i, \quad (39)$$

which in turn can be solved to obtain α^* , as long as $2M - n \neq 0$. This leads to (34). Then, by introducing $\sigma \triangleq (\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n) \in \{-1, 1\}^n$ to denote whether an agent belongs to category I or II, we have $\kappa_i = (1 - \sigma_i)\frac{\pi}{2} + \alpha_i + \sigma_i\alpha^*$ and $\sin \kappa_i = \sin(\alpha^* + \sigma_i\alpha_i)$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Also, M is the cardinality of the set $\{\sigma_i | \sigma_i = 1, i = 1, \dots, n\}$.

Whenever $\kappa_{ib} = \pi/2$, the positivity conditions (30)-(31) can readily be expressed as (33). Then, it remains




Fig. 3. Graphical representation of *all possible* solution of (36), where $\alpha_c^* = \pi - \alpha^*$. However, due to the closure and positivity constraints, a particular branch of this tree might not yield a plausible solution for κ_i .

to show that (33) also encompasses the situation when $\kappa_{ib} = -\pi/2$, for which these conditions simplify to

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda \cos \alpha_0 - (1 - \lambda) \sin \alpha^* &> 0 \\ \sin(\alpha^* + \sigma_i \alpha_i) &< 0. \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

By introducing $\hat{m} \triangleq m + 2M - n$, we can show that (33), with $\hat{m}$ substituted into (34), leads to (40). This establishes the second statement of the theorem. $\square$

Remark 3 The possibility of having $2M - n = 0$ cannot be ruled out for an even number of agents. Moreover, (39) holds true in that case if and only if $\sum \alpha_i$ is an integer multiple of π , and it leads to a continuum of relative equilibria of the shape dynamics.

Remark 4 At a relative equilibrium, the angular separation between agent i and agent $i + 1$ is given by the angle $2\kappa_i$.

Remark 5 Along the leftmost branch of the binary tree in Figure 3, i.e. when (37a) holds true for each pair of agents, α^* can be expressed as

$$\alpha^* = m \left(\frac{\pi}{n} \right) - \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{\alpha_i}{n} \right). \quad (41)$$

5 Local Stability Analysis

We now introduce another simplifying assumption which will govern the analysis in the subsequent sections of this work:

(A4) The bearing angles toward the neighbor are

equal for all agents, i.e. $\alpha_i = \alpha$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. This assumption, by sacrificing its universality to some extent, provides tractability for our subsequent analytical investigation.

To investigate local stability of a relative equilibrium, we first define $\xi_i \triangleq \{\rho_i, \kappa_i, \theta_i, \rho_{ib}, \kappa_{ib}\}$, which allows us to express the shape dynamics (18) for agent- i as $f(\xi_{i-1}, \xi_i, \xi_{i+1})$. Then, by letting $\xi \triangleq \{\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_n\}$ denote the collective shape, we introduce

$$\begin{aligned} g_0(\xi) &\triangleq \sum_{i=1}^n (\pi + \kappa_i - \theta_{i+1}), \\ g_1^i(\xi) &\triangleq \rho_i - \rho_{ib} \cos(\kappa_{ib} - \kappa_i) - \rho_{i+1,b} \cos(\kappa_{i+1,b} - \theta_{i+1}), \\ g_2^i(\xi) &\triangleq \rho_{ib} \sin(\kappa_{ib} - \kappa_i) + \rho_{i+1,b} \sin(\kappa_{i+1,b} - \theta_{i+1}), \end{aligned}$$

for $i = 1, \dots, n$. As these three functions express the shape variable constraints (12)-(13) as $g_0(\xi) = g_1^i(\xi) = g_2^i(\xi) = 0$, the $(3n - 1)$ -dimensional shape space $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathbb{R}^{5n}$ can be defined as

$$\mathcal{M} = \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^{5n} | g_0(\xi) = g_1^i(\xi) = g_2^i(\xi) = 0, \forall i\},$$

and as discussed earlier $\mathcal{M}$ is invariant under the closed loop shape dynamics (18). Therefore we focus our analysis on the dynamics restricted to this manifold $\mathcal{M}$.

Now we restrict our focus onto a counter-clockwise (CCW) circling equilibrium along the leftmost branch of the binary tree in Figure 3 (as in Remark 5). Clearly, $\alpha^* = \frac{m\pi}{n} - \alpha$ and $\kappa_i = \frac{m\pi}{n}$, $\kappa_{ib} = \pi/2$, $i = 1, \dots, n$ for this equilibrium. Then, by letting

$$\bar{\xi} \triangleq \{\bar{\xi}_1, \bar{\xi}_2, \dots, \bar{\xi}_n\} \quad (42)$$

represent this shape equilibrium, we introduce $\zeta_i \triangleq \xi_i - \bar{\xi}_i$ to denote a small perturbation around this equilibrium. Due to the cyclic nature of the interaction between agents, the linearized dynamics around $\bar{\xi}_i$ can be expressed as

$$\dot{\zeta}_i = A_0 \zeta_i + A_1 \zeta_{i+1} + A_{-1} \zeta_{i-1}, \quad (43)$$

where $A_0, A_1, A_{-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{5 \times 5}$ are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} A_0 &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \sin\left(\frac{m\pi}{n}\right) & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -\lambda q_1 & \lambda q_2 - q_3 & 0 & 0 & q_5 \\ (1-\lambda)q_1 & -(1-\lambda)q_2 - q_3 & -q_2 & 0 & q_5 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ (1-\lambda)q_1 & -(1-\lambda)q_2 - q_3 & 0 & q_4 & q_5 \end{bmatrix}^T \\ A_1 &= \begin{bmatrix} 0_{2 \times 5} \\ \sin\left(\frac{m\pi}{n}\right) - \lambda q_2 & (1-\lambda)q_2 & 0 & (1-\lambda)q_2 \\ 0_{2 \times 5} \end{bmatrix} \\ A_{-1} &= \begin{bmatrix} 0_{2 \times 5} \\ -q_1 & q_2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0_{2 \times 5} \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

with q_1, q_2, q_3, q_4 and q_5 given by

$$\begin{aligned} q_1 &= \frac{\mu^2}{2} \left(\cos \alpha_0 + \left(\frac{1}{\lambda} - 1\right) \sin \alpha^* \right)^2 \csc\left(\frac{m\pi}{n}\right) \\ q_2 &= \frac{\mu}{2} \left(\cos \alpha_0 + \left(\frac{1}{\lambda} - 1\right) \sin \alpha^* \right) \cot\left(\frac{m\pi}{n}\right) \\ q_3 &= \mu(1-\lambda) \cos \alpha^* \\ q_4 &= -2q_1 \sin\left(\frac{m\pi}{n}\right) \\ q_5 &= -\mu\lambda \sin \alpha_0. \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

Then by representing the complete shape dynamics as

$$\dot{\xi} = \mathbf{F}(\xi), \quad (45)$$

its linearization around an equilibrium $\bar{\xi}$ can be expressed as $\dot{\zeta} = \hat{A}\zeta$, where $\hat{A}$ is defined as

$$\hat{A} \triangleq \frac{\partial \mathbf{F}}{\partial \xi} \Big|_{\bar{\xi}} = \text{circ}(A_0, A_1, 0_{5 \times 5}, 0_{5 \times 5}, \dots, A_{-1}), \quad (46)$$

with *circ* denoting a block circulant matrix. As discussed in Appendix A, the shape variable constraints yield $(2n + 1)$ imaginary axis eigenvalues, and following the approach described in [20], we can characterize the local stability of the equilibrium in terms of the remaining $(3n - 1)$ eigenvalues. The following proposition characterizes the eigenvalues of $\hat{A}$.

Proposition 6 *The eigenvalues of $\hat{A}$ are given by the*

union of the eigenvalues of

$$\begin{aligned} & A_0 + A_1 + A_{-1} \\ & A_0 + \omega A_1 + \omega^{-1} A_{-1} \\ & \vdots \\ & A_0 + \omega^{n-1} A_1 + \omega^{-(n-1)} A_{-1} \end{aligned},$$

where $\omega = e^{2\pi j/n}$ is the n -th root of unity.

Proof. As described in [7], we can express $\hat{A}$ as

$$\hat{A} = (F_n \otimes \mathbb{I}_m)^* \text{diag}(D_0, D_1, \dots, D_{n-1}) (F_n \otimes \mathbb{I}_m),$$

where the k -th diagonal block D_k is defined as

$$D_k = A_0 + \omega^k A_1 + \omega^{-k} A_{-1} \quad (47)$$

for $k = 0, \dots, n-1$, and $\omega = e^{2\pi j/n}$ denotes the n -th root of unity. Moreover, F_n is a $n \times n$ Fourier matrix given by $[F_n]_{kl} = \omega^{(k-1)(l-1)}$, and we can show that $(F_n \otimes \mathbb{I}_m)^* (F_n \otimes \mathbb{I}_m) = \mathbb{I}_{mn}$. Then it easily follows that the eigenvalues of $\hat{A}$ are the union of the eigenvalues of individual blocks, i.e. of D_k 's. $\square$

As investigating the stability of $\hat{A}$ can lead to necessary conditions for stability of the equilibrium $\bar{\xi}$, we begin the next step of our analysis by computing $P_k(x)$, the characteristic polynomial of D_k , as

$$\begin{aligned} P_k(x) &= x^5 + \mu \left[b + \left(\frac{a}{2} \right) (1 - \lambda)(1 - \omega^k) \cot \left(\frac{m\pi}{n} \right) \right] x^4 \\ &+ \left(\frac{\mu^2 a}{2} \right) [2a + (1 - \omega^k)d + \lambda a(1 + \omega^k)] x^3 \\ &+ \left(\frac{\mu^3 a^2}{2} \right) (1 - \lambda)(1 - \omega^k) \left(\cos \alpha^* + a \cot \left(\frac{m\pi}{n} \right) \right) x^2 \\ &+ \mu^3 a^2 b x^2 + \left(\frac{\mu^4 a^3}{2} \right) [(1 - \omega^k)d + \lambda a(1 + \omega^k)] x \\ &+ \left(\frac{\mu^5 a^4}{2} \right) (1 - \omega^k)(1 - \lambda) \cos \alpha^*, \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

where a , b and d are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} a &= \cos \alpha_0 + \left(\frac{1}{\lambda} - 1 \right) \sin \alpha^*, \\ b &= \lambda \sin \alpha_0 + (1 - \lambda) \cos \alpha^*, \\ \text{and, } d &= a + (1 - \lambda) \cos \alpha^* \cot \left(\frac{m\pi}{n} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

Clearly, a should be positive for existence of the relative equilibrium $\bar{\xi}$ (from 33). Moreover, we can factorize the

characteristic polynomial as

$$P_k(x) = (x^2 + \mu^2 a^2) \left[(x^3 + \mu \tilde{c}_k x^2 + \mu^2 a \tilde{d}_k x + \mu^3 a^2 \tilde{e}_k) - j(\mu \hat{c}_k x^2 - \mu^2 a \hat{d}_k x + \mu^3 a^2 \hat{e}_k) \right], \quad (50)$$

where $\tilde{c}_k$, $\hat{c}_k$, $\tilde{d}_k$, $\hat{d}_k$, $\tilde{e}_k$ and $\hat{e}_k$ ($k = 0, \dots, n-1$) are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{c}_k &= b + a(1 - \lambda) \sin^2 \left(\frac{k\pi}{n} \right) \cot \left(\frac{m\pi}{n} \right) \\ \hat{c}_k &= a(1 - \lambda) \sin \left(\frac{k\pi}{n} \right) \cos \left(\frac{k\pi}{n} \right) \cot \left(\frac{m\pi}{n} \right) \\ \tilde{d}_k &= d \sin^2 \left(\frac{k\pi}{n} \right) + \lambda a \cos^2 \left(\frac{k\pi}{n} \right) \\ \hat{d}_k &= (\lambda a - d) \sin \left(\frac{k\pi}{n} \right) \cos \left(\frac{k\pi}{n} \right) \\ \tilde{e}_k &= (1 - \lambda) \cos \alpha^* \sin^2 \left(\frac{k\pi}{n} \right) \\ \hat{e}_k &= (1 - \lambda) \cos \alpha^* \sin \left(\frac{k\pi}{n} \right) \cos \left(\frac{k\pi}{n} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

Theorem 7 Consider the counter-clockwise circling equilibrium $\bar{\xi}$ (42) of the beacon-referenced cyclic pursuit system with n -agents. The following conditions must hold true for stability of this equilibrium:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{c}_k &> 0 \\ \tilde{c}_k(\tilde{c}_k \tilde{d}_k - a \tilde{e}_k) - \hat{d}_k(\tilde{c}_k \hat{c}_k + a \hat{d}_k) &> 0 \\ \Gamma_k^2 \tilde{e}_k + \Gamma_k \Lambda_k \hat{d}_k - \Lambda_k^2 \tilde{c}_k &> 0 \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

for each $k = 0, \dots, n-1$, where Γ_k and Λ_k are defined as

$$\Gamma_k = \tilde{c}_k(\tilde{c}_k \tilde{d}_k - \hat{c}_k \hat{d}_k) - a(\hat{d}_k \hat{d}_k + \tilde{c}_k \tilde{e}_k) \quad (53)$$

$$\Lambda_k = \tilde{c}_k(\hat{c}_k \tilde{e}_k - \tilde{c}_k \hat{e}_k) + a \hat{d}_k \tilde{e}_k. \quad (54)$$

Proof. As the spectrum of $\hat{A}$ is given by the union of eigenvalues of individual diagonal blocks $D_k = A_0 + \omega^k A_1 + \omega^{-k} A_{-1}$, $\hat{A}$ will not have any eigenvalue on the right half plane if and only if the eigenvalues of D_k do not have any positive real part for each $k = 0, \dots, n-1$. Hence, the conditions under which the relevant eigenvalues of $\hat{A}$ will be on the left half plane will lead to necessary conditions for stability of the equilibrium $\bar{\xi}$.

It follows from (50) that $P_k(x)$ has a pair of pure imaginary roots at $x = \pm j\mu a$ for each $k = 0, \dots, n-1$. As these pure imaginary roots correspond to the coordinate constraints, we shift our focus to uncover the conditions under which each root of the second cubic factor will be on the left half plane (LHP).

Next, following the general Routh-like algorithm for complex polynomials, developed by Agashe [1], and by exploiting the fact that $\mu > 0$, we can show that the roots of the cubic factor will have strictly negative real part *if and only if* (52) holds true. Therefore, (52) must be true for each k , for the equilibrium $\bar{\xi}$ to be a stable one. $\square$

Corollary 8 *The bearing angle parameters α and α_0 must satisfy*

$$\lambda \sin \alpha_0 + (1 - \lambda) \cos \left(\frac{m\pi}{n} - \alpha \right) > 0, \quad (55)$$

for stability of the counter-clockwise circling equilibrium $\bar{\xi}$ of the beacon-referenced cyclic pursuit system with n -agents.

Proof. By setting $k = 0$ in (51), we have $\tilde{c}_0 = b$, $\tilde{d}_0 = \lambda a$ and $\hat{c}_0 = \hat{d}_0 = \tilde{e}_0 = \tilde{e}_0 = 0$, where a and b are defined by (49). Then it directly follows from Theorem 7 that b must be positive for the CCW circling equilibrium $\bar{\xi}$ to be stable. $\square$

Corollary 9 *Consider the counter-clockwise circling equilibrium $\bar{\xi}$ of the beacon-referenced cyclic pursuit system with n -agents. Then, whenever n is even, the following conditions must hold true for stability of this equilibrium:*

$$\begin{aligned} \cos \alpha^* &> 0 \\ \lambda \sin \alpha_0 + (1 - \lambda) \left(\cos \alpha^* + a \cot \left(\frac{m\pi}{n} \right) \right) &> 0 \\ bd + a(1 - \lambda) \left[d \cot \left(\frac{m\pi}{n} \right) - \cos \alpha^* \right] &> 0. \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

Proof. By setting $k = n/2$, it directly follows from Theorem 7. $\square$

Remark 10 *By exploiting the fact that a , b and d do not depend on μ (49), it can be inferred from (48) that μ just provides a scaling for the eigenvalues of diagonal blocks D_k . Then, as μ is assumed to be positive, it readily follows that the stability of $\hat{A}$ is not influenced by μ .*

6 An invariant manifold with pure shape equilibria

In addition to circling equilibria, numerical simulations based on the shape dynamics (18) indicate the existence of spiraling “pure shape equilibria” that maintain the shape of the collective up to geometric similarity, as depicted in Figure 4. Pure shape equilibria were analyzed for cyclic pursuit systems (without a beacon) in [11] by means of rescaling the time variable. The time-scaling approach does not work in the beacon-referenced

case, because the resulting pure shape dynamics are not self-contained (i.e. they are dependent on the size of the formation). However, we can use a change of variables to demonstrate the existence of a family of $(3n - 3)$ -dimensional invariant manifolds on which the pure shape of the collective is constant.

6.1 A change of variables

We start with the shape variables developed in (7) and proceed by defining the following change of variables

$$\phi_{ib} \triangleq \kappa_{ib} - \kappa_i, \quad \psi_i \triangleq \theta_i - \kappa_i, \quad \tilde{\rho}_i \triangleq \frac{\rho_i}{\rho_1}, \quad \tilde{\rho}_{ib} \triangleq \frac{\rho_{ib}}{\rho_1}, \quad (57)$$

for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Based on (12) and (13), we have equivalent constraints on the new shape variables given by

$$R \left(\sum_{i=1}^n (\pi - \psi_i) \right) = \mathbb{I}_2 \quad (58)$$

$$\tilde{\rho}_i \mathbb{I}_2 = \tilde{\rho}_{ib} R(\phi_{ib}) + \tilde{\rho}_{i+1,b} R(\phi_{i+1,b} - \psi_{i+1}), \quad (59)$$

for $i = 1, \dots, n$.

Pure shape equilibria correspond to configurations for which $\phi_{ib}, \psi_i, \tilde{\rho}_i$, and $\tilde{\rho}_{ib}$ are all constant for every $i = 1, \dots, n$, and all κ_i vary at the same rate. Therefore we also define

$$\tilde{\kappa}_i \triangleq \kappa_i - \kappa_{i+1}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad (60)$$

subject to the constraint

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{\kappa}_i = 0. \quad (61)$$

It can be shown that our shape dynamics (18) can be parametrized in an alternative (but equivalent) form in terms of the variables κ_1, ρ_1 , and $\{\tilde{\kappa}_i, \psi_i, \phi_{ib}, \tilde{\rho}_i, \tilde{\rho}_{ib}\}_{i=1}^n$. First, we note that in terms of these variables we have

$$\kappa_i = \kappa_1 + \sum_{j=i}^n \tilde{\kappa}_j, \quad (62)$$

and to simplify notation, we will denote

$$\kappa_i^+ \triangleq \kappa_i + \kappa_{i+1} = 2\kappa_1 + \tilde{\kappa}_i + 2 \sum_{j=i+1}^n \tilde{\kappa}_j. \quad (63)$$

We also denote

$$\Phi_i \triangleq \kappa_i^+ + \psi_{i+1}, \quad \Psi_i \triangleq \tilde{\kappa}_i - \psi_{i+1}, \quad (64)$$




Fig. 4. This Matlab simulation shows spiraling out trajectories of the full space dynamics (1) for $n = 3$, with $\alpha_0 = 11\pi/12$ and $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \alpha_3 = 7\pi/12$. The observation that the trajectories appear to converge to a particular pure shape motivates the analysis in Section 6.

so that, by appropriate sum-to-product trigonometric identities, the shape dynamics (18) can be expressed in terms of the new variables as

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{\kappa}_1 &= -\mu \left[(1 - \lambda) \sin(\kappa_1 - \alpha) + \lambda \sin(\phi_{1b} + \kappa_1 - \alpha_0) \right] \\
&\quad + \frac{2\lambda \sin\left(\frac{\Phi_1}{2}\right) \cos\left(\frac{\Psi_1}{2}\right)}{\rho_1}, \\
\dot{\rho}_1 &= -2 \cos\left(\frac{\Phi_1}{2}\right) \cos\left(\frac{\Psi_1}{2}\right), \\
\dot{\kappa}_i &= -2\mu \left[(1 - \lambda) \sin\left(\frac{\tilde{\kappa}_i}{2}\right) \cos\left(\frac{\kappa_i^+ - 2\alpha}{2}\right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \lambda \sin\left(\frac{\phi_{ib} - \phi_{i+1,b} + \tilde{\kappa}_i}{2}\right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. \times \cos\left(\frac{\phi_{ib} + \phi_{i+1,b} + \kappa_i^+ - 2\alpha_0}{2}\right) \right] \\
&\quad + \frac{2\lambda}{\rho_1} \left[\frac{\sin\left(\frac{\Phi_i}{2}\right) \cos\left(\frac{\Psi_i}{2}\right)}{\tilde{\rho}_i} - \frac{\sin\left(\frac{\Phi_{i+1}}{2}\right) \cos\left(\frac{\Psi_{i+1}}{2}\right)}{\tilde{\rho}_{i+1}} \right], \\
\dot{\rho}_i &= \frac{2}{\rho_1} \left[\tilde{\rho}_i \cos\left(\frac{\Phi_1}{2}\right) \cos\left(\frac{\Psi_1}{2}\right) - \cos\left(\frac{\Phi_i}{2}\right) \cos\left(\frac{\Psi_i}{2}\right) \right], \\
\dot{\psi}_i &= \frac{2}{\rho_1} \left[\frac{\sin\left(\frac{\Phi_{i-1}}{2}\right) \cos\left(\frac{\Psi_{i-1}}{2}\right)}{\tilde{\rho}_{i-1}} - \frac{\sin\left(\frac{\Phi_i}{2}\right) \cos\left(\frac{\Psi_i}{2}\right)}{\tilde{\rho}_i} \right], \\
\dot{\rho}_{ib} &= \frac{1}{\rho_1} \left[2\tilde{\rho}_{ib} \cos\left(\frac{\Phi_1}{2}\right) \cos\left(\frac{\Psi_1}{2}\right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \cos\left(\phi_{ib} + \kappa_1 + \sum_{j=i}^n \tilde{\kappa}_j\right) \right], \\
\dot{\phi}_{ib} &= \frac{1}{\rho_1} \left[\frac{1}{\tilde{\rho}_{ib}} \sin\left(\phi_{ib} + \kappa_1 + \sum_{j=i}^n \tilde{\kappa}_j\right) - \frac{2 \sin\left(\frac{\Phi_i}{2}\right) \cos\left(\frac{\Psi_i}{2}\right)}{\tilde{\rho}_i} \right],
\end{aligned} \tag{65}$$

for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$, subject to the constraints (58)-(59) and the positivity constraint for ρ_1 , $\tilde{\rho}_i$, and $\tilde{\rho}_{ib}$.

6.2 An invariant submanifold

We now demonstrate the existence of a family of invariant submanifolds for which all dynamics are zero except for $\dot{\kappa}_1$ and $\dot{\rho}_1$. We start by assuming $\cos\left(\frac{\Phi_i}{2}\right) \neq 0$ and $\cos\left(\frac{\Psi_i}{2}\right) \neq 0$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$, and then setting $\dot{\tilde{\rho}}_i = 0$ to obtain

$$\frac{\tilde{\rho}_i}{\tilde{\rho}_{i-1}} = \frac{\cos\left(\frac{\Phi_i}{2}\right) \cos\left(\frac{\Psi_i}{2}\right)}{\cos\left(\frac{\Phi_{i-1}}{2}\right) \cos\left(\frac{\Psi_{i-1}}{2}\right)}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \tag{66}$$

If we further assume that $\sin\left(\frac{\Phi_i}{2}\right) \neq 0$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$, then we can set $\dot{\psi}_i = 0$ to get

$$\frac{\tilde{\rho}_i}{\tilde{\rho}_{i-1}} = \frac{\sin\left(\frac{\Phi_i}{2}\right) \cos\left(\frac{\Psi_i}{2}\right)}{\sin\left(\frac{\Phi_{i-1}}{2}\right) \cos\left(\frac{\Psi_{i-1}}{2}\right)}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \tag{67}$$

so that equating (66) with (67) yields (for all i)

$$\sin\left(\frac{\Phi_i}{2}\right) \cos\left(\frac{\Phi_{i-1}}{2}\right) - \cos\left(\frac{\Phi_i}{2}\right) \sin\left(\frac{\Phi_{i-1}}{2}\right) = 0. \tag{68}$$

Since (68) can be expressed as

$$\sin\left(\frac{\Phi_i - \Phi_{i-1}}{2}\right) = 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \tag{69}$$

our resulting requirement is

$$\Phi_1 = \Phi_2 = \dots = \Phi_n = \Phi \tag{70}$$

for some angle Φ not dependent on the index i . Then by (64) we have

$$\psi_i = \Phi - \kappa_{i-1}^+, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \tag{71}$$

and by substitution into (58) with some manipulation, we have $R\left(n\left(\pi - \Phi + \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\kappa_i^+}{n}\right)\right) = \mathbb{I}_2$, i.e.

$$\pi - \Phi + \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\kappa_i^+}{n} = \frac{2k\pi}{n}, \quad \text{for some } k \in \{0, 1, \dots, n\}. \tag{72}$$

Combining (71) with (72), we have

$$\psi_i = \left(\frac{n-2k}{n}\right)\pi - \kappa_{i-1}^+ + \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\kappa_j^+}{n}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \tag{73}$$

Before proceeding, we also note that substituting (70) into (67) implies

$$\frac{\tilde{\rho}_i}{\tilde{\rho}_{i-1}} = \frac{\cos\left(\frac{\Psi_i}{2}\right)}{\cos\left(\frac{\Psi_{i-1}}{2}\right)}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \tag{74}$$

Now we set $\dot{\phi}_{ib}$ equal to zero, to arrive at

$$\frac{\tilde{\rho}_{ib}}{\tilde{\rho}_i} = \frac{\sin\left(\phi_{ib} + \kappa_1 + \sum_{j=i}^n \tilde{\kappa}_j\right)}{2 \sin\left(\frac{\Phi}{2}\right) \cos\left(\frac{\Psi_i}{2}\right)}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad (75)$$

and set $\dot{\rho}_{ib}$ equal to zero to obtain

$$\tilde{\rho}_{ib} = \frac{\cos\left(\phi_{ib} + \kappa_1 + \sum_{j=i}^n \tilde{\kappa}_j\right)}{2 \cos\left(\frac{\Phi}{2}\right) \cos\left(\frac{\Psi_i}{2}\right)}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (76)$$

For $i = 1$, since $\tilde{\rho}_1 = 1$ we can equate (75) with (76) to arrive at

$$\frac{\sin(\phi_{1b} + \kappa_1)}{2 \sin\left(\frac{\Phi}{2}\right) \cos\left(\frac{\Psi_1}{2}\right)} = \frac{\cos(\phi_{1b} + \kappa_1)}{2 \cos\left(\frac{\Phi}{2}\right) \cos\left(\frac{\Psi_1}{2}\right)}, \quad (77)$$

(where we have used (61)), which in turn yields

$$\sin\left(\phi_{1b} + \kappa_1 - \frac{\Phi}{2}\right) = 0. \quad (78)$$

For any i , (75) with (76) implies

$$\tilde{\rho}_i = \frac{\sin\left(\frac{\Phi}{2}\right) \cos\left(\frac{\Psi_i}{2}\right) \cos\left(\phi_{ib} + \kappa_1 + \sum_{j=i}^n \tilde{\kappa}_j\right)}{\cos\left(\frac{\Phi}{2}\right) \cos\left(\frac{\Psi_i}{2}\right) \sin\left(\phi_{ib} + \kappa_1 + \sum_{j=i}^n \tilde{\kappa}_j\right)}, \quad (79)$$

and thus by dividing (79) by the corresponding expression for $\tilde{\rho}_{i-1}$ and equating with (74), we have

$$\frac{\cos\left(\phi_{ib} + \kappa_1 + \sum_{j=i}^n \tilde{\kappa}_j\right) \sin\left(\phi_{i-1,b} + \kappa_1 + \sum_{j=i-1}^n \tilde{\kappa}_j\right)}{\sin\left(\phi_{ib} + \kappa_1 + \sum_{j=i}^n \tilde{\kappa}_j\right) \cos\left(\phi_{i-1,b} + \kappa_1 + \sum_{j=i-1}^n \tilde{\kappa}_j\right)} = 1. \quad (80)$$

Thus

$$\sin\left(\phi_{ib} + \kappa_1 + \sum_{j=i}^n \tilde{\kappa}_j - \left(\phi_{i-1,b} + \kappa_1 + \sum_{j=i-1}^n \tilde{\kappa}_j\right)\right) = 0, \quad (81)$$

which implies

$$\sin(\phi_{ib} - \phi_{i-1,b} - \tilde{\kappa}_{i-1}) = 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (82)$$

Therefore the angle quantity in (82) must be a multiple

of π , and we proceed by considering the case² where it is an even multiple of π , i.e.

$$\phi_{ib} - \phi_{i-1,b} - \tilde{\kappa}_{i-1} = 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (83)$$

Under this assumption, setting $\dot{\kappa}_i = 0$ in (65) yields

$$-2\mu(1-\lambda) \sin\left(\frac{\tilde{\kappa}_i}{2}\right) \cos\left(\frac{\kappa_i^+ - 2\alpha}{2}\right) = 0, \quad (84)$$

since (74) guarantees that the last term of $\dot{\kappa}_i$ is zero. This condition will be satisfied for all μ and all λ if either the sine term is zero or the cosine term is zero, and we proceed by considering the case in which the sine term in (84) is zero, i.e.

$$\tilde{\kappa}_i = 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (85)$$

Note from (63) that this implies

$$\kappa_i^+ = 2\kappa_1, \quad (86)$$

and thus by substitution into (73), we have

$$\psi_i = \left(\frac{n-2k}{n}\right) \pi, \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (87)$$

Therefore by (64), (85), (86) and (87) we have (for all i)

$$\Phi = 2\kappa_1 + \left(\frac{n-2k}{n}\right) \pi, \quad \Psi_i = \left(\frac{2k-n}{n}\right) \pi. \quad (88)$$

Substitution into (74) yields

$$\frac{\tilde{\rho}_i}{\tilde{\rho}_{i-1}} = \frac{\cos\left(\frac{2k-n}{2n} \pi\right)}{\cos\left(\frac{2k-n}{2n} \pi\right)} = 1, \quad (89)$$

for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$, and since $\tilde{\rho}_1 \equiv 1$, we have

$$\tilde{\rho}_i = 1, \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (90)$$

Lastly, we note that substituting (85) into (83) yields

$$\phi_{ib} = \phi_{i-1,b}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (91)$$

² Note that we do incur a loss of generality with this step and several of the following steps, but our aim is only to derive sufficient conditions for existence of an invariant manifold related to pure shape equilibria. Future work will consider all the alternative options to determine necessary conditions as well.

We can determine an expression for ϕ_{1b} by returning to (78) and considering the case for which the angle quantity is an even multiple of π , for which

$$\phi_{1b} = -\kappa_1 + \frac{\Phi}{2} = \left(\frac{n-2k}{2n} \right) \pi, \quad (92)$$

and combining with (91) yields

$$\phi_{ib} = \left(\frac{n-2k}{2n} \right) \pi, \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (93)$$

Finally, substituting (85), (88), and (93) into (76), we have

$$\tilde{\rho}_{ib} = \frac{1}{2 \sin\left(\frac{k\pi}{n}\right)}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad (94)$$

requiring $k \neq 0, n$ to ensure that $\tilde{\rho}_{ib}$ is well-defined.

We summarize our results in the following theorem.

Theorem 11 *For any $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, n-1\}$, the manifold $\mathcal{M}_k$ defined by*

$$\mathcal{M}_k \triangleq \left\{ \kappa_1, \rho_1, \{\tilde{\kappa}_i, \psi_i, \phi_{ib}, \tilde{\rho}_i, \tilde{\rho}_{ib}\}_{i=1}^n \mid \begin{aligned} &\tilde{\kappa}_i = 0, \tilde{\rho}_i = 1, \\ &\psi_i = \left(\frac{n-2k}{n} \right) \pi, \phi_{ib} = \left(\frac{n-2k}{2n} \right) \pi, \\ &\tilde{\rho}_{ib} = \frac{1}{2 \sin\left(\frac{k\pi}{n}\right)} \end{aligned} \right\}, \quad (95)$$

is nonempty and invariant under the dynamics (65), with 2-dimensional reduced dynamics on the manifold given by

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\kappa}_1 &= -\mu \left[(1-\lambda) \sin(\kappa_1 - \alpha) + \lambda \cos\left(\kappa_1 - \frac{k\pi}{n} - \alpha_0\right) \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{2\lambda}{\rho_1} \cos\left(\kappa_1 - \frac{k\pi}{n}\right) \sin\left(\frac{k\pi}{n}\right) \\ \dot{\rho}_1 &= -\cos \kappa_1 + \cos\left(\kappa_1 - \frac{2k\pi}{n}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (96)$$

Proof. The invariance of $\mathcal{M}_k$ follows from the calculations above, so it remains to establish that the constraints associated with $\mathcal{M}_k$ satisfy the consistency constraints (58)-(59). First note that substituting the $\mathcal{M}_k$ constraints into the left-hand side of (58) yields

$$R\left(\sum_{i=1}^n (\pi - \psi_i)\right) = R\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \left(\pi - \left(\frac{n-2k}{n}\right) \pi\right)\right) = \mathbb{I}_2,$$

and therefore (58) is satisfied. Next, we substitute the $\mathcal{M}_k$ constraints into (59) and simplify to get

$$\tilde{\rho}_{ib} R(\phi_{ib}) + \tilde{\rho}_{i+1,b} R(\phi_{i+1,b} - \psi_{i+1}) = \mathbb{I}_2, \quad (97)$$

where we have used the property $R(\theta) + R(-\theta) = 2 \cos(\theta) \mathbb{I}_2$. Since $\tilde{\rho}_i = 1$, the constraint (59) is satisfied. The form for the reduced dynamics can be obtained by substitution of the manifold constraints into (65). $\square$

7 Analysis of reduced dynamics on the pure shape manifold

Theorem 11 describes conditions under which a manifold exists which is invariant under the dynamics (65), with 2-dimensional reduced dynamics on the manifold given by (96). In this section we analyze (96) to determine the behavior of trajectories on the invariant manifold.

To simplify the analysis, we let $\lambda = 1/2$, $\mu = 2$ so that the first equation in (96) can be reformulated as

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\kappa}_1 &= -\sin(\kappa_1 - \alpha) - \cos\left(\kappa_1 - \frac{k\pi}{n} - \alpha_0\right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\rho_1} \cos\left(\kappa_1 - \frac{k\pi}{n}\right) \sin\left(\frac{k\pi}{n}\right) \\ &= -\sin(\kappa_1 - \alpha) - \sin\left(\kappa_1 - \left(\frac{2k-n}{2n}\right) \pi - \alpha_0\right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\rho_1} \cos\left(\kappa_1 - \frac{k\pi}{n}\right) \sin\left(\frac{k\pi}{n}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (98)$$

If we let

$$\gamma_{k,n} \triangleq \frac{2k-n}{4n}, \quad \alpha_0^+ \triangleq \frac{\alpha_0 + \alpha}{2}, \quad \alpha_0^- \triangleq \frac{\alpha_0 - \alpha}{2}, \quad (99)$$

then by appropriate sum-to-product trigonometric identities, our dynamics on the manifold can be formulated as

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\kappa}_1 &= -2 \sin(\kappa_1 - \gamma_{k,n} \pi - \alpha_0^+) \cos(\gamma_{k,n} \pi + \alpha_0^-) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\rho_1} \cos\left(\kappa_1 - \frac{k\pi}{n}\right) \sin\left(\frac{k\pi}{n}\right) \\ \dot{\rho}_1 &= 2 \sin\left(\kappa_1 - \frac{k\pi}{n}\right) \sin\left(\frac{k\pi}{n}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (100)$$

Since $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, n-1\}$ it holds that $\sin(k\pi/n) > 0$, and therefore equilibria for (100) (if they exist) must satisfy $\sin(\kappa_1 - k\pi/n) = 0$. Substituting $\kappa_1 = k\pi/n$ into the $\dot{\kappa}_1$ equation and setting equal to zero yields the equilibrium value for ρ_1 , given by

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_1 &= \frac{\sin\left(\frac{k\pi}{n}\right)}{2 \sin\left(\frac{k\pi}{n} - \gamma_{k,n} \pi - \alpha_0^+\right) \cos(\gamma_{k,n} \pi + \alpha_0^-)} \\ &= \frac{\sin\left(\frac{k\pi}{n}\right)}{2 \cos(\gamma_{k,n} \pi - \alpha_0^+) \cos(\gamma_{k,n} \pi + \alpha_0^-)}. \end{aligned} \quad (101)$$

Analogous calculations show that substituting $\kappa_1 = k\pi/n + \pi$ into the $\dot{\kappa}_1$ equation yields the same equilibrium value for ρ_1 , with the requirement (in both cases) that the denominator of (101) must be positive in order to maintain $\rho_1 > 0$.

Thus circling equilibria exist on the manifold $\mathcal{M}_k$ if and only if $\cos(\gamma_{k,n}\pi - \alpha_0^+) \cos(\gamma_{k,n}\pi + \alpha_0^-) > 0$, with equilibrium values given by (101) and $\kappa_1 = k\pi/n$ or $\kappa_1 = k\pi/n + \pi$. By linearization one can show that the $\kappa_1 = k\pi/n$ equilibrium is stable (and the $\kappa_1 = k\pi/n + \pi$ equilibrium is unstable) if $\sin(\gamma_{k,n}\pi - \alpha_0^+) \cos(\gamma_{k,n}\pi + \alpha_0^-) < 0$, with the opposite statement holding when this term is positive. This can be related to the conditions in Theorem 2 for a particular value of k by letting $\sigma_i = 1$ and $m = k$ or $m = k + n$ in part (b) of Theorem 2.

We now consider the case where

$$\cos(\gamma_{k,n}\pi - \alpha_0^+) \cos(\gamma_{k,n}\pi + \alpha_0^-) \leq 0 \quad (102)$$

and therefore circling equilibria do not exist. The following proposition describes a region that is positively invariant under the reduced dynamics (100).

Proposition 12 *Consider an n -agent system evolving on the manifold $\mathcal{M}_k$, and let $\gamma_{k,n}$, α_0^+ and α_0^- be defined as in (99). If α and α_0 satisfy (102), then the region*

$$\Delta = \left\{ (\kappa_1, \rho_1) : \kappa_1 \in \left(\frac{k\pi}{n}, \frac{k\pi}{n} + \pi \right), \rho_1 > 0 \right\} \quad (103)$$

is positively invariant under the dynamics (100), i.e. trajectories which enter or start in the region will stay in the region for all future time.

Proof. First, we note from (100) that $\dot{\rho}_1 > 0$ on Δ , and therefore trajectories can not leave the region through the $\rho_1 = 0$ boundary. We proceed by considering the behavior of trajectories on the other boundaries of Δ defined by $\kappa_1 = \frac{k\pi}{n}$ and $\kappa_1 = \frac{k\pi}{n} + \pi$. Along the boundary where $\kappa_1 = \frac{k\pi}{n}$, we have (from (100))

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\kappa}_1 &= -2 \sin\left(\frac{k\pi}{n} - \gamma_{k,n}\pi - \alpha_0^+\right) \cos(\gamma_{k,n}\pi + \alpha_0^-) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\rho_1} \sin\left(\frac{k\pi}{n}\right) \\ &= -2 \cos(\gamma_{k,n}\pi - \alpha_0^+) \cos(\gamma_{k,n}\pi + \alpha_0^-) + \frac{1}{\rho_1} \sin\left(\frac{k\pi}{n}\right) \\ &> 0, \end{aligned} \quad (104)$$

where we have used (102) and the fact that $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, n-1\}$. A similar set of calculations demonstrates that $\dot{\kappa}_1 < 0$ along the boundary where $\kappa_1 = \frac{k\pi}{n} + \pi$, which establishes the proposition. $\square$




Fig. 5. The (κ_1, ρ_1) phase portrait for the dynamics (100) with $n = 3$, $k = 2$, $\alpha_0 = 11\pi/12$, and $\alpha = 7\pi/12$. The shaded area depicts the positively invariant region Δ , with trajectories approaching the asymptote $\kappa_1 = \gamma_{2,3}\pi + \alpha_0^+ = 5\pi/6$. We note that the agent trajectories depicted in Figure 4 correspond to the phase portrait trajectory shown here which starts at the solid circle.

We can better understand the behavior of trajectories of (100) on the region Δ by considering the quantity $V_{k,n} \triangleq -\cos(\kappa_1 - \gamma_{k,n}\pi - \alpha_0^+)$. Taking the derivative, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V}_{k,n} &= \dot{\kappa}_1 \sin(\kappa_1 - \gamma_{k,n}\pi - \alpha_0^+) \\ &= -2 \sin^2(\kappa_1 - \gamma_{k,n}\pi - \alpha_0^+) \cos(\gamma_{k,n}\pi + \alpha_0^-) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\rho_1} \sin(\kappa_1 - \gamma_{k,n}\pi - \alpha_0^+) \cos\left(\kappa_1 - \frac{k\pi}{n}\right) \sin\left(\frac{k\pi}{n}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (105)$$

If $\cos(\gamma_{k,n}\pi + \alpha_0^-) > 0$, then the first term in (105) will be strictly negative and will dominate for large values of ρ_1 . We recall that $\dot{\rho}_1 > 0$ on Δ , and eventually $\dot{V}_{k,n}$ will be strictly negative and decreasing towards $V_{k,n} = -1$, i.e. κ_1 will asymptotically approach the value $\gamma_{k,n}\pi + \alpha_0^+$. If $\cos(\gamma_{k,n}\pi + \alpha_0^-) < 0$, then an analogous argument with $\hat{V}_{k,n} \triangleq \cos(\kappa_1 - \gamma_{k,n}\pi - \alpha_0^+)$ demonstrates that κ_1 will approach the value $\gamma_{k,n}\pi + \alpha_0^+ + \pi$. These behaviors are depicted in the phase portrait representation in Figure 5, which corresponds to the spiraling behaviors in the physical space depicted in Figure 4.

Remark 13 *Theorem 11 establishes the invariance of the manifold $\mathcal{M}_k$ but does not address the conditions under which the manifold is attractive, and the results of Proposition 12 must be interpreted with this in mind. Numerical simulations of the full system dynamics ((1) with (14)) reveal the existence of other system trajectories (such as periodic trajectories with precession) which do not evolve on $\mathcal{M}_k$, suggesting that $\mathcal{M}_k$ is not attractive for all parameter choices. An analysis of the attractivity of the subject manifold will be carried out in future work.*

8 Conclusion

In this paper, we have proposed a modification of the constant bearing pursuit law which references a fixed beacon as well as a neighboring agent, and have demonstrated that implementation of such control law in a cycle graph (with “spokes”) yields an interesting set of closed-loop dynamics. Analysis of these dynamics revealed that the associated relative equilibria corresponds to circling of the agents around the beacon. We have also shown that the circling radius and angular separation between the agents are determined by parameters of the control law, not by initial conditions (as was the case in earlier works on cyclic pursuit with constant bearing feedback law [11]). This independence from initial conditions has made this modified framework better suited for station keeping applications. Then, after deriving necessary conditions for stability of the relative (circling) equilibria, we have characterized the invariant manifolds corresponding to spiral motions which preserve scale-invariant pure shape of the collective, and analyzed the motion on this invariant manifold. An experimental implementation of this framework was described in [9], and interested readers may refer to the implementation videos at <http://ter.ps/beaconcb>.

Future work will analyze the attractivity of these pure shape manifolds, and investigate the existence of more complicated invariant submanifolds within the shape space suggested by numerical simulations. We are also interested in extending our framework to 3-d settings, as well as considering scenarios with multiple beacons or slowly moving beacons.

References

- [1] S. Agashe. A new general Routh-like algorithm to determine the number of RHP roots of a real or complex polynomial. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 30(4):406 – 409, 1985.
- [2] M. Ballerini, N. Cabibbo, R. Candelier, A. Cavagna, E. Cisbani, I. Giardina, V. Lecomte, A. Orlandi, G. Parisi, A. Procaccini, M. Viale, and V. Zdravkovic. Interaction ruling animal collective behavior depends on topological rather than metric distance: Evidence from a field study. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 105(4):1232 – 1237, 2008.
- [3] B. Bethke, J. P. How, and J. Vian. Multi-UAV Persistent Surveillance With Communication Constraints and Health Management. In *Proceedings of the AIAA Guidance, Navigation, and Control Conference (GNC)*, page 5654, 2009.
- [4] R. L. Bishop. There is more than one way to frame a curve. *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 82(3):246 – 251, 1975.
- [5] A. Cavagna, A. Cimarelli, I. Giardina, G. Parisi, R. Santagati, F. Stefanini, and M. Viale. Scale-free correlations in starling flocks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 107(26):11865 – 11870, 2010.
- [6] S. Daingade, A. Sinha, A. V. Borkar, and H. Arya. A variant of cyclic pursuit for target tracking applications: theory and implementation. *Autonomous Robots*, 40(4):669 – 686, 2016.
- [7] P. J. Davis. *Circulant Matrices*. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, second edition, 1994.
- [8] M. Dunbabin and L. Marques. Robots for Environmental Monitoring: Significant Advancements and Applications. *IEEE Robotics Automation Magazine*, 19(1):24 – 39, 2012.
- [9] K. S. Galloway and B. Dey. Station keeping through beacon-referenced cyclic pursuit. In *Proceedings of American Control Conference (ACC)*, pages 4765 – 4770, 2015.
- [10] K. S. Galloway and B. Dey. Stability and pure shape equilibria for beacon-referenced cyclic pursuit. In *Proceedings of American Control Conference (ACC)*, pages 161 – 166, 2016.
- [11] K. S. Galloway, E. W. Justh, and P. S. Krishnaprasad. Symmetry and reduction in collectives: cyclic pursuit strategies. *Proceedings of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Science*, 469(2158), 2013.
- [12] K. S. Galloway, E. W. Justh, and P. S. Krishnaprasad. Symmetry and reduction in collectives: low-dimensional cyclic pursuit. *Proceedings of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Science*, 472(2194), 2016.
- [13] G. Hollinger, S. Singh, J. Djughash, and A. Kehagias. Efficient multi-robot search for a moving target. *The International Journal of Robotics Research*, 28(2):201 – 219, 2009.
- [14] Y. Inada and K. Kawachi. Order and flexibility in the motion of fish schools. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 214(3):371 – 387, 2002.
- [15] E. W. Justh and P. S. Krishnaprasad. Equilibria and steering laws for planar formations. *Systems & Control Letters*, 52(1):25 – 38, 2004.
- [16] T. Kim and T. Sugie. Cooperative Control for Target-Capturing Task Based on a Cyclic Pursuit Strategy. *Automatica*, 43(8):1426 – 1431, 2007.
- [17] N. E. Leonard, D. A. Paley, R. E. Davis, D. M. Fratantoni, F. Lekien, and F. Zhang. Coordinated Control of an Underwater Glider Fleet in an Adaptive Ocean Sampling Field Experiment in Monterey Bay. *Journal of Field Robotics*, 27(6):718 – 740, 2010.
- [18] Y. Liu and G. Nejat. Robotic Urban Search and Rescue: A Survey from the Control Perspective. *Journal of Intelligent & Robotic Systems*, 72(2):147 – 165, 2013.
- [19] G. R. Mallik, S. Daingade, and A. Sinha. Consensus based deviated cyclic pursuit for target tracking applications. In *Proceedings of European Control Conference (ECC)*, pages 1718 – 1723, 2015.
- [20] J. A. Marshall, M. E. Broucke, and B. A. Francis. Formations of Vehicles in Cyclic Pursuit. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 49(11):1963 – 1974, 2004.
- [21] J. A. Marshall, M. E. Broucke, and B. A. Francis. Pursuit Formations of Unicycles. *Automatica*, 42(1):3 – 12, 2006.
- [22] M. Nagy, Z. Akos, D. Biro, and T. Vicsek. Hierarchical group dynamics in pigeon flocks. *Nature*, 464:890 – 893, 2010.
- [23] J. L. Ramirez, M. Pavone, E. Frazzoli, and D.W. Miller. Distributed Control of Spacecraft Formation via Cyclic Pursuit: Theory and Experiments. In *Proceedings of American Control Conference (ACC)*, pages 4811 – 4817, 2009.
- [24] P. Romanczuk, I. D. Couzin, and L. Schimansky-Geier. Collective motion due to individual escape and pursuit response. *Physical Review Letters*, 102(1):010602, 2009.
- [25] T. D. Seeley, S. Camazine, and J. Sneyd. Collective decision-making in honey bees: how colonies choose among nectar

sources. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, 28(4):277 – 290, 1991.

- [26] A. Sinha and D. Ghose. Generalization of Nonlinear Cyclic Pursuit. *Automatica*, 43(11):1954 – 1960, 2007.
- [27] S. L. Smith, M. E. Broucke, and B. A. Francis. A Hierarchical Cyclic Pursuit Scheme for Vehicle Networks. *Automatica*, 41(6):1045 – 1053, 2005.
- [28] E. Wei, E. W. Justh, and P. S. Krishnaprasad. Pursuit and an evolutionary game. *Proceedings of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Science*, 465(2105):1539 – 1559, 2009.

A $(2n + 1)$ Eigenvalues on Imaginary Axis

As discussed in [20], invariance of $\mathcal{M}$ under the dynamics (18) implies that there exists a change of basis which will transform $\hat{A}$ into an upper block triangular form.

It easy to check that a suitable explicit form for the change of basis is given by $\psi = \Gamma(\xi)$ defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_1 &= \rho_1, \psi_2 = \kappa_1, \psi_3 = \theta_2, \psi_4 = \rho_2, \dots, \psi_{3n-3} = \theta_n, \\ \psi_{3n-2} &= \rho_{1b}, \psi_{3n-1} = \kappa_{1b}, \psi_{3n} = g_0(\xi), \\ \psi_{3n+1} &= g_1^1(\xi), \psi_{3n+2} = g_2^1(\xi), \dots, \psi_{5n} = g_2^n(\xi), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.1})$$

and subsequent calculations yield

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{g}_0(\xi) &= \left(\frac{\partial g_0(\xi)}{\partial \xi} \right)^T F(\xi) = 0 \\ \dot{g}_1^i(\xi) &= \left(\frac{\partial g_1^i(\xi)}{\partial \xi} \right)^T F(\xi) = - \left(\frac{\sin \kappa_i + \sin \theta_{i+1}}{\rho_i} \right) g_2^i(\xi) \\ \dot{g}_2^i(\xi) &= \left(\frac{\partial g_2^i(\xi)}{\partial \xi} \right)^T F(\xi) = \left(\frac{\sin \kappa_i + \sin \theta_{i+1}}{\rho_i} \right) g_2^i(\xi). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, the corresponding equilibrium $\bar{\psi} = \Gamma(\bar{\xi})$ is equal to $\bar{\xi}$ (up to rearranging), except that the last $2n + 1$ components are replaced by 0's. Then, by computing linearization about this equilibrium $\bar{\psi}$, we get

$$\dot{\psi} = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{A}_{11} & * & * & \cdots & * \\ 0_{1 \times (3n-1)} & 0 & 0_{1 \times 2} & \cdots & 0_{1 \times 2} \\ 0_{2 \times (3n-1)} & 0_{2 \times 1} & \hat{A}_1 & \cdots & 0_{2 \times 2} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0_{2 \times (3n-1)} & 0_{2 \times 1} & 0_{1 \times 2} & \cdots & \hat{A}_n \end{bmatrix} \psi, \quad (\text{A.2})$$

where $\hat{A}_i, i = 1, \dots, n$ are defined as

$$\hat{A}_i = \left[\begin{array}{cc} 0 & -\frac{\sin \kappa_i + \sin \theta_{i+1}}{\rho_i} \\ \frac{\sin \kappa_i + \sin \theta_{i+1}}{\rho_i} & 0 \end{array} \right] \Big|_{\bar{\xi} = \Gamma^{-1}(\bar{\psi})}. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

It is clear from (A.3) that, for a counter-clockwise circling equilibrium with $M = n$, $\hat{A}_i$ has a pair of pure imaginary eigenvalues at $\delta = \pm j\mu(\cos \alpha_0 + (\frac{1}{\lambda} - 1)\sin \alpha^*)$. Then, by exploiting the properties of a block triangular matrix, it can easily be shown that $\hat{A}$ has a single eigenvalue at $\delta = 0$ and n pairs of repeated eigenvalues at $\delta = \pm j\mu(\cos \alpha_0 + (\frac{1}{\lambda} - 1)\sin \alpha^*)$.